REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 19-21, 39, 41, 43, and 44 have been amended.

It is respectfully requested that the right to swear behind the cited references is preserved.

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 19, 21, 39, 41 and 43 are objected to because of informalities.

Examiner rejected claims 1-12, 15, 17-20, 21-32, 35, 37-41, 43, and 44 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0129060 to Rollins et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,675,354 to Claussen et al.

Examiner rejected claims 13, 14, 16, 33, 34, 36, 42, and 45 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rollins and Claussen in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,760,748 to Hakim.

Response to Claim Objections

Claims have been amended to correct informalities. It is respectfully requested that the objections be withdrawn

Response to rejections of claims 1-12, 15, 17-20, 21-32, 35, 37-41, 43, and 44 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Rollins is directed at a system method for generating multiple customizable interfaces for XML documents (Rollins, Title).

The Office action cites Rollins at paragraph [0038] to show creating a "class that extends the abstract command tag for providing execution logic for said at least one custom action" recited in claim 1. Specifically, the Office action refers to the phrase "a set of Java classes designed to mediate communication between the user and the synchronized tree manager." It is submitted that although Rollins discloses, at paragraph [0038], a set of Java classes resulting from a user selecting and isolating a series of interface-generating components (code generation), there is no indication that the resulting set of Java classes **extend the abstract command tag** in order to provide execution logic for a custom action in addition to pre-existing logic that supports said at least some generic Web application activities.

Furthermore, the Office action fails to address the feature of "creating a corresponding customized command tag that is capable of being embedded within a Web page," as recited in claim 1.

Claussen specifically discusses the processing and handling of custom tags, and does not address the creation of such tags. Claussen does not teach or suggest either creating a "class that extends the abstract command tag for providing execution logic for said at least one custom action" or "creating a corresponding customized command tag that is capable of being embedded within a Web page," as recited in claim 1. Rollins and Claussen, whether considered separately or in combination with Rollins, fails to disclose or suggest these features recited in claim 1.

Because not each and every element of claim 1 is disclosed in Rollins and Claussen, whether considered separately or in combination, claim 1 and its dependent

claims are patentable over the combination of Rollins and Claussen and should be allowed.

Claim 21, recites "specifying at least one custom action that is desired to be performed by a Web application under development, by supporting creation of an object oriented programming language (OOPL) class that extends the abstract command tag for providing execution logic for said at least one custom action, thereby creating a corresponding customized command tag that is capable of being embedded within a Web page." Thus, claim 21 and its dependent claims are patentable over the combination of Rollins and Claussen for at least the reasons articulated with respect to claim 1.

The Office action failed to address every element of claim 41. For example, the features of "a non-programmatic tag framework that implements the functionality of the application framework when executing within a JavaServer Pages (JSP) page" and "tag-based Web application objects controlling program flow, executing user commands, representing application business objects, and constructing output" are not addressed in the Office action. It is submitted that Rollins and Claussen, whether considered separately or in combination with Rollins, fails to disclose or suggest these features recited in claim 41.

Because not each and every element of claim 41 is disclosed in Rollins and Claussen, whether considered separately or in combination, claim 41 and its dependent claims are patentable over the combination of Rollins and Claussen and should be allowed.

Response to rejections of claims 13, 14, 16, 33, 34, 36, 42, and 45 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office action combines Rollins, Claussen, and Hakim to show the features of claims 13, 14, and 16, which depend on claim 1, and claims 34, and 36, which depend on claim 21, and claims 42 and 45 which depend on claim 41. Each of these claims includes the limitations of its respective parent claim.

Hakim is concerned with a computer-based, networked electronic classroom system in which the teacher can monitor class progress, ask questions, and generally focus efforts in areas where more instruction appears to be needed. (Hakim, 3: 15-21.)

Hakim does not teach or suggest either creating a "class that extends the abstract command tag for providing execution logic for said at least one custom action" or "creating a corresponding customized command tag that is capable of being embedded within a Web page," as recited in claims 1 and 21, whether considered separately or in combination with Rollins and Claussen. Claims 13, 14, and 16 include the limitations of claim 1 by virtue of being dependent on claim 1. Claims 33, 34, and 36 include the limitations of claim 21 by virtue of being dependent on claim 21.

Similarly, neither Rollins, nor Claussen, nor Hakim, nor a combination thereof teach or suggest such features of claim 41 as "tag-based Web application objects controlling program flow, executing user commands, representing application business objects, and constructing output"; and "a non-programmatic tag framework that accesses data for logical business objects and allows page designers to specify an action to be performed." Claims 42 and 45 include the limitations of claim 41 by virtue of being dependent on claim 41. Therefore, claims 13, 14, 16, 33, 34, 36, 42, and 45

are patentable over the combination of Rollins, Claussen, and Hakim for at least the reasons articulated with respect to claims 1 and 41.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the amendments and discussion set forth herein, the applicable rejections have been overcome. Accordingly, the present and amended claims should be found to be in condition for allowance.

If a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, Examiner is invited to contact Elena Dreszer at (408) 720-8300.

If there are any additional charges/credits, please charge/credit our deposit account no. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 10-28-05

Elena B. Dreszer
Reg. No. 55,128

Customer No. 08791
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(408) 720-8300